DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 843 SP 024 229

AUTHOR Morawa, Edward C.; Sheathelm, Herbert H.
TITLE Teachers' Perceptions of Need Fulfillment and Self-Esteem and Their Attitudes toward Change.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (68th, New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; Educational Change; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; *Individual Needs; *Instructional Innovation; *Job Satisfaction; *Self Esteem; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

A study investigated whether teachers with high levels of need fulfillment and self-esteem had more positive attitudes toward school change than teachers with low levels of need fulfillment and self-esteem. The study sample consisted of 101 elementary school teachers participating in the Connecticut School Effectiveness Project, a major innovation sponsored by the state's department of education. The research instrument used in this study was a three part package. The first part asked for information on demographic variables: teacher's role (classroom or specialist), classroom setting (self-contained or teamed), and teachers' education degree. Part 2 dealt with job satisfaction, and the third part was concerned with changed attitudes. It was found that need fulfillment and self-esteem alone were not related to teachers' attitudes toward change. A relationship existed between self-esteem and task change attitude, but not personal change attitude. Self-esteem did not appear to be a predictor of change attitude. Copies of the three questionnaires used in the study are appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED243843

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF NEED FULFILLMENT AND SELF-ESTEEM AND THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD CHANGE

Edward C. Morawa

New Britain Public Schools
New Britain, Connecticut

Herbert H. Sheathelm

School of Education
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06268

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edward C. Morawa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of

The American Educational Research Association

New Orleans, Louisiana

April 1984

SP024229

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF NEED FULFILLMENT AND SELF-ESTEEM AND THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD CHANGE

NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

The introduction of change to public schools characteristically has been a slow, difficult affair. A major factor in the dilatory pace of school change has been the resistant attitudes of teachers (Sarason, 1971; House, 1974; Goodlad, 1975). Still, there are numerous examples which suggest that the way changes are introduced in schools fosters conditions nurturant of negative attitudes. Among these dissatisfactory factors are threats to teachers' autonomy (Miles, 1964; Lortie, 1975), implied slights to their competence (Blumberg, 1980), low reward (House, 1974), and role ambiguity (Miles, 1980). These dissatisfiers can threaten the teacher's sense of self-esteem and need fulfillment, making change an unrewarding prospect with dubious motivational potential. The problem of this research was: Do teachers with high levels of need fulfillment and self-esteem have more positive attitudes toward school changes than teachers with low levels of need fulfillment and self-esteem?

Conceptual Background

The theoretical structure of this research was derived from three major perspectives. These were Hall's (1979) Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), Porter's (1961) discrepancy approach

to job satisfaction, and Hackman and Lawler's (1971) model of job motivation and satisfaction. A description of each and their interrelationship follows.

Concerns-Based Adoption Model

Hall's (1979) Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) theory of change assumes that the success of educational organizational change is to a great extent related to personal dimensions of individual organization members. CBAM treats change as a process in which teachers and administrators pass through a predictable series of stages of concern. Concerns may include attitudes, as well as "the composite representation of the feelings, preoccupation, thought, and consideration given to a particular issue or task..." (Hall, George, and Rutherford, 1979). CBAM consists of three basic frames of reference. The first, "Stages of Concern," dealing with attitudinal dynamics of adopters of innovations, is relevant to this research.

Hall and associates (1979) assume that change entails developmental growth in terms of an individual's affect and knowledge about the innovation. Adopters pass through a series of stages, in which concerns about the innovation progress from issues extrinsic to it to ones dealing with the change task itself. They have collapsed the seven stages of concern into three groups:

1. self concerns - Refer to one's perceived adequacy to master the innovation. Self-esteem concerns are relevant to this group. Includes stages 0 (awareness), 1 (informational), and 2 (personal).

2. management concerns - Refers to processual aspects of the innovation. Includes stage 3 (management).

3. impact (or task) concerns - Refers to intrinsic task aspects of the innovation which affect targets. Includes stages 4 (consequence), 5 (collaboration), and 6 (refocusing).

Although CBAM recognizes that there are different degrees of arousal in each stage (Hall, et al., 1979, p. 5), it does not explain what motivates teachers to pass through them or whether certain psychological variables can differentiate the intensity of teachers' concerns. As with any developmental process, the possibility exists that individuals vary in the way they experience stages of it. This research addressed that issue, by relating teachers' perceptions of need fulfillment and self-esteem and the intensity of their concerns at stages 1 and 2, personal concern stages, and at stages 4 and 5, task concern stages. A favorable change attitude was characterized by a high degree of concern for mastery of the innovation and a low degree of personal concern. An unfavorable attitude resulted from opposite intensities in each case.

Discrepancy Approach to Job Satisfaction

The basic assumption of discrepancy models of job satisfaction is that satisfaction is based on differences between outcomes received and other outcomes such as what the person wants or expects. Dissatisfaction is conceptualized as differences in these levels and is greater as wants exceed receipts. Discrepancy models are additive, in that overall satisfaction is assumed to be influenced by the sum of discrepancies present

for each job facet.

This research was informed by the discrepancy theory presented by Porter (1961, 1962). This widely used approach to job satisfaction employs Maslow's need hierarchy as its framework. Porter describes job satisfaction as a function of the discrepancy in the perceived relationship between need fulfillment actually received compared to that which the employee thinks should be present. Satisfaction is greater as the discrepancy is smaller.

Porter's model offers several advantages to this research. First, it provides for individual expectations of reward in addition to actual fulfillment as essential components of satisfaction. Second, as Porter and Lawler (1968) point out, it concentrates on individual perceptions through its focus on need fulfillment. This is an advantage in studying teacher attitudes compared to environmentally based models such as two-factor theory. Third, Porter's model emphasizes the importance of intrinsic job rewards through responses to higher level need items. This fits the intrinsic task aspect of change acceptance. Finally, attitude is related to performance through the discrepancy between need fulfillment that should be present compared to that which is actually present.

Extrinsic and Intrinsic Elements of Job-Satisfaction

Hackman and Lawler (1971) proposed a view of job motivation and satisfaction which is based on the relationship of job characteristics to employee attitudes and behavior, in terms of

motivation, satisfaction, and performance. They suggest that worker perceptions of their jobs are more important components of their attitudes and behaviors than objective job elements, which serve as determinants of their perceptions. Their theory claims that individual differences in desires for higher order need satisfactions moderate the relationship between job characteristics and employee motivation and satisfaction. Essentially, intrinsic job elements (i.e., autonomy, variety, task identity, feedback) motivate workers at higher need levels and are sources of satisfaction to them. Persons at lower need levels are not motivated or satisfied by these job dimensions because their fulfillment is derived from sources extrinsic to the work itself. Higher order need satisfaction is both the result of effective performance (an end state) and an incentive to continued efforts to perform effectively (a motivator).

The Hackman and Lawler theory does not appear to have been used in any previous studies of teachers' attitudes in change processes. However, in tandem with Hall's Concerns-Based Adoption Model, it is proposed as a framework in which teachers' motivations in these situations can be analyzed. The personal concern stages (1 and 2) in CBAM pertain to elements extrinsic to the teachers' task, while impact stages (4 and 5) are intrinsic task elements. Applying the Hackman and Lawler model to the CBAM stages, teachers with strong higher order needs were expected to have less intense personal concerns and more intense task concerns than teachers at lower need levels, who were expected to display opposite intensities. This implied

that the former group would present a more favorable attitude toward a change, since it would be perceived as a source of task satisfaction by them.

Thus, the problem of this research was: Do teachers with high levels of need fulfillment and self-esteem have more positive attitudes toward school changes than teachers with low levels of need fulfillment and self-esteem?

Methodology

Sample

The sample consisted of 101 elementary school teachers from three Connecticut districts participating in the Connecticut School Effectiveness Project, a major innovation sponsored by the Connecticut State Department of Education.

The objectives of this research were not tied to any particular innovation. The School Effectiveness Project was the data base for the study, selected in terms of the following criteria:

1. It is an actual, major innovation.
2. It involves all members of the school staff, as opposed to innovations directed at segments of the staff.
3. This innovation is being conducted in many districts, cancelling out effects of local factors in teacher's attitudes.
4. The psychological processes in this research are appropriate to the initial phases of innovation. These participants in the School Effectiveness Project were at an early point.

The sample was stratified into the following categories: educational level (BA, MA, Sixth Year and Ph.D.), role (class-

room teacher or specialist), setting (self-contained or teamed). Educational level, role, and setting were included as demographic variables because the literature had indicated that they could be sources of variation in teachers' attitudes toward change.

Instrumentation

The research instrument used in this study was a three part package. The first part supplied information about the demographic variables, the second part dealt with job satisfaction, and the third part was concerned with change attitudes.

Demographic Variables

As indicated, the demographic variables in this research were teachers' role (classroom or specialist), setting (self-contained or teamed), and educational degree level (BA, MA, Sixth Year and Ph.D.). The "Professional Factors Information Sheet" was used by respondents to supply information on these variables (see Appendix A).

Porter Need Satisfaction Questionnaire

The independent variables, need satisfaction and self-esteem, were considered as elements of job satisfaction in this investigation. Data on these variables were obtained by the Porter Need Satisfaction Questionnaire (PNSQ)(Porter, 1962; adapted for use in schools by Trusty and Sergiovanni, 1966). (See Appendix A.) The PNSQ is a widely used instrument for job satisfaction research in industrial and educational organizations. It contains thirteen items which are derived from Maslow's need hierarchy (exclusive of physiological needs).

Dore and Meacham (1973) calculated test-retest reliability at .83. Waters and Roach's (1974) factor analysis substantiated its use as a differentiator of lower and higher order need satisfaction, and Weber and Hadd (1974) validated the five dimensions of the PNSQ.

Stages of Concern Questionnaire

The dependent variables, change attitude, was measured by the Stages of Concern Questionnaire (SoC) (Hall, et. al., 1979). (See Appendix A.) Derived from the Concerns-Based Adoption Model, the SoC contains thirty-five items in seven scales (0-6). Four scales, with twenty items, were used in this research - scales 1, 2, 4, 5.

Stages 1 and 2 were treated as the personal dimension of change attitude because the concerns expressed by these items are extrinsic to the change task itself. They deal with informational needs (scale 1) or personal threats (scale 2). High scores on this dimension indicated an unfavorable change attitude.

Stages 4 and 5 were considered the task dimension of change attitude. The concerns expressed by these items dealt with intrinsic elements of the change task. Stage 4 relates teacher concerns to consequences of the innovation for students, while stage 5 investigates teacher efforts to collaborate with others to increase student benefits from the innovation. High scores on these items suggested a favorable change attitude because they indicate that the teacher is strongly concerned with

mastering the change task itself.

George (1981) reported the internal reliability of scales 1 and 2 at .89 and scales 4 and 5 as .85. Hall, et al., (1979) indicated test-retest reliabilities of .76-.84 for these scales.

Data Collection Procedures

Prior to actual data gathering, respondents had taken part in a number of activities related to the School Effectiveness Project, conducted by consultants from the Connecticut State Department of Education. The consultants had supplied orientational information about the project, and had interviewed and administered questionnaires to respondents about their perceptions of the presence of certain characteristics identified as being present in effective schools (Edmonds, 1979). The consultants analyzed these data and reported them back to the faculty. At this meeting, the researcher joined the School Effectiveness staff and presented the job satisfaction and change attitude questionnaires immediately after the data report. This time seemed appropriate because the report presented faculty perceptions of their school's status regarding school effectiveness characteristics. Perceived needs in these areas formed the basis of change efforts. In other words, the report was analogous to a stimulus which made the change a real issue that had to be faced by the faculty. Questionnaires were administered to all faculty members present at that meeting.

Analytic Procedures

The hypotheses of this study were grouped into three components for analytic purposes. Independent variables were need

fulfillment and self-esteem, with role, setting, and educational level as demographic variables. The dependent variable, change attitude, had two dimensions. The personal dimension refers to personal concerns, factors extrinsic to the change task. The task dimension referred to concerns about mastering intrinsic elements of the innovation. Two analyses were done for each hypothesis, using one of the dimensions of change attitude as the dependent variable in each analysis.

Component 1

Hypothesis 1 was investigated to determine whether there is a relationship between need fulfillment and change attitude (both dimensions) for the whole sample, regardless of the demographic variables. Zero-order correlations were used for these analyses. Sub-hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c were examined to determine whether a relationship existed between need fulfillment and change attitude (both dimensions) for each of the demographic variables, after the effects of the other two demographic variables had been partialed out. Partial correlations were used to examine each of these sub-hypotheses.

Component 2

This group of hypotheses was similar to Component 1, except that self-esteem was the independent variable, instead of need fulfillment. Zero-order correlations were used to examine the major hypothesis, and partial correlations were used for the sub-hypotheses.

Component 3

This was the main analysis of this research. Its chief purpose was to determine the best linear combination of pre-

dictors of change attitude, for each dimension. Independent and dependent variables corresponded to the preceding description. Separate multiple regression analyses were made for each dimension of change attitude.

This analysis was organized into two sets. In the first set, change attitude was regressed on the need fulfillment components alone, with one regression equation for personal change attitude and one for task change attitude. There were also two confirmatory regressions of each change attitude on total need fulfillment. In the second set, change attitude was regressed on the demographic variables and the need fulfillment components. Similarily, there was one regression for each change attitude, and two confirmatory regressions of each change attitude on the demographic variables and total need fulfillment.

The fact that self-esteem is a sub-set of need fulfillment was a possible confound of this analysis. Covariation between need fulfillment and self-esteem could have reduced the unique contribution of the second variable in explaining variance in the dependent variable (Kerlinger, 1973). This problem was dealt with by creating new variables from the highly intercorrelated ones and using these in the regression equation (Nie, et al., 1975). Need fulfillment was considered in three parts: security and social needs, self-esteem needs; and self-actualization needs. This arrangement separated the influence of self-esteem, allowing one to determine whether it significantly added to explanation of change attitudes over lower

level needs.

The possibility of causal relations among independent variables was controlled by hierarchical entry to the regression equation (Nie, et al., 1975). This procedure decomposes explained variance into orthogonal units and checks for multicollinearity among predictors. Variables are entered into the equation in a specified order. In this research, hierarchical ordering was done for lower levels of need fulfillment, self-esteem, and self-actualization, respectively. The demographic variables, not in any causal relationships, were entered by a stepwise solution. This order of entry treated the independent variables as if they were covariates. Where multiple R did not increase significantly, it indicated that a particular variable was not a predictor of change attitude.

Results

Zero-order correlations used to analyze Hypotheses 1 and 2 indicated that need fulfillment and self-esteem, respectively, were unrelated to teachers' personal or task concerns about this innovation. The sub-hypotheses which dealt with role, setting and educational level indicated a similar outcome of no relationship.

However, among the sub-hypotheses, significant relationships occurred between need fulfillment and both personal and task concerns for role, with the effects of setting and educational level removed. These relationships were significant only for classroom teachers (personal change attitude: $r = -.248$,

$p < .038$; task change attitude: $r = -.288$, $p < .019$). The direction of these relationships suggests that low levels of need discrepancy (or high job satisfaction) are related to high levels of both change attitudes. There was also a significant relationship between self-esteem and task change attitude for role, following the removal of the effects of setting and educational level. Again, this relationship was significant only for classroom teachers (task change attitude: $r = -.243$, $p < .041$). The relationship between self-esteem and personal change attitude was non-significant for both role groups.

The analysis of Component 3 indicated that role and lower level needs were related to personal change concerns, while role and higher level needs were relevant to task change concerns. The first set of regression equations, dealing with the relationship of the need fulfillment components and both personal and task change attitude revealed that this independent variable set accounted for an insignificant percentage of variance in the dependent variable. In both equations, at no point was any regression weight significant. Confirmatory equations pointed to similar results. These outcomes strongly suggest that for this sample need fulfillment, considered as a total construct or in its constituent variables, was in itself unrelated to teachers' change attitudes.

The second set of regressions added the demographic variables of role, setting, and educational level to the need fulfillment components as predictors of both change attitudes.

TABLE 1

Multiple Regression for the Prediction of Personal
hange Attitude from Demographic Variables and Need Fulfillment Components

Step	Variable Entered	R	SE_{EST}	R^2	Increase in R^2	b	B	F_b
1	Role	.225	.229	.050		-.589	-.252	6.598^{xx}
2	SN1[a]	.318	.106	.101	$.051^{x}$	-.222	-.203	4.319^{xx}
	CONSTANT						6.098	
1	Level	.007	.268	.000				
1	Setting	.063	.237	.061	.010			
3	SN3	.326	.117	.106	.005			

Note: Significant predictors are those above the dotted line. Regression weights (b) and beta weights (B) are from the optimal equation.

$x_p < .05$

$xx_p < .01$

[a]Legend:
SN1 = Security and Social Needs
SN2 = Esteem Needs
SN3 = Self-Actualization Needs

TABLE 2

Multiple Regression for the Prediction of Task Change Attitude from Demographic Variables and Need Fulfillment Components

Step	Variable Entered	R	SE_{EST}	R^2	Increase in R^2	b	B	F_b
1	Role	.187	.232	.035		-.519	-.225	5.005^{xx}
2	SN3	.282	.108	.080	$.045^{x}$	-.226	-.213	4.380^{xx}
	CONSTANT						5.338	
1	Level	.050	.269	.002				
1	Setting	.194	.241	.037				
3	SN1	.283	.115	.080				
4	SN2	.284	.174	.080				

Note: Significant predictors are those above the dotted line. Regression weights (b) and beta weights (B) are from the optimal equation.

$x_p < .05$

$xx_p < .01$

Table 1 reveals data which is consistent with anticipated relationships, as lower level needs are related to personal change concerns, issues extrinsic to the innovation task itself. Role, the only demographic variable to enter the equation, apparently supplies engagement with the innovation which is necessary for the psychological variables to become more meaningful. This confirms and expands the partial correlational data reported above. Role, with its multiple R of .225, accounted for 5 percent (R^2) of the variance in personal change attitude. Comparison of the beta-weights points to role making a slightly greater contribution to the variance in personal change attitude than lower level needs, the second predictor in this equation. The inclusion of lower level needs raised multiple R to .318 ($p < .05$), accounting for 10 percent (R^2) of the variance in personal change attitude. The sharp decrease in the estimated standard error is an indication of the added explanation lower level needs provide, as is the significant regression weight ($p < .01$). This result was supported in the confirmatory equation.

The data in Table 2 indicate that the highest level need component, self-actualization needs, is related to task change attitudes, factors intrinsic to the innovation itself. As with personal change attitude, role was the only demographic variable to enter the equation, again demonstrating the vital character of degree of involvement with the innovation for the motivational variables to become effective. As in the preceding equation, role entered first, with a multiple R of .187, explaining 3.5

percent (R^2) of the variance in task change attitude. Comparison of the beta weights shows that role and self-actualization needs was a greater influence on task change attitude. entered the equation at the second step. Multiple R at this step was raised to .282 ($p < .05$), accounting for 8 percent (R^2) of the variance in task change attitude. The standard error of estimate decreased markedly with the addition of self-actualization, indicative of its explanatory power. The regression weight ($p < .01$) pointed to a similar interpretation. The confirmatory equation supported these results.

Consistent with the preceding equation, the percentage of explained variance in task change attitude is small, but the direction of this relationship is striking and complementary to the former result. Just as lower level needs related to personal concerns, higher level needs related to task concerns. Each result is as anticipated, suggesting that the Hackman and Lawler model of job motivation and satisfaction may be a motivational complement to the stages of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model.

Discussion of Findings

Four major issues resulted from the research. Their implications and relation to previous research are presented here.

Finding 1: Need fulfillment and self-esteem alone were not related to teachers' attitudes toward change, for personal or task dimensions.

Although need satisfaction and self-esteem were at high levels for the entire sample (cf. Anderson, 1981; Yarworth,

1978), they were unrelated to either personal or task change attitudes. Despite the level of perceived personal strength these variables may provide one to be receptive to future innovations, they do not create personal engagement with present changes. Without involvement, the demands of an innovative task are irrelevant to an employee, rendering his/her need satisfaction unrelated to the change.

A problem in relating the theoretical and empirical literature on need satisfaction and self-esteem to this finding is that degree of involvement in the task a behavior under question was seldom an issue. In field studies (e.g., Hackman and Lawler, 1971; Brief and Aldag, 1975; Kerr Inkson, 1978) and laboratory experiments (e.g., Korman, 1970; Greenhaus and Badin, 1974) subjects were measured at their normal, routine tasks or at ones in which the experimenters created high levels of involvement in the test situation. These studies generally confirmed that high levels of need fulfillment or self-esteem were related to greater task satisfaction or to better performance. The present research suggests that while these variables may provide favorable personal conditions to approach change tasks, in themselves they do not generate involvement with the present task.

Finding 2: A relationship exists between self-esteem and task change attitude, but not personal change attitude, for classroom teachers.

It was anticipated that high levels of self-esteem would be associated with low personal concerns, indicating that self-

esteem supplied confidence and personal strength to minimize these concerns. Although classroom teachers did display high self-esteem scores, they were still troubled by needs for more information or by self-concerns.

The outcome of task concerns and self-esteem occurred in the expected direction, with high self-esteem showing a relationship to high task concerns. This means that classroom teachers associated self-esteem with an interest in learning more about the innovation. This conforms to past research on self-esteem and task satisfaction (Korman, 1970; Bhagat and Chassie, 1978; Lopez and Greenhaus, 1978), extending these earlier findings to change situations. Korman explains that this relationship occurs because high self-esteem persons attribute success to their own efforts, creating motivation to perform the task in anticipation of satisfaction.

It is suggested that this finding be interpreted cautiously, subject to further investigation. It occurred with a relatively small group (m = 52). Additionally, self-esteem was consistently not a factor in any regression equation. This may have been influenced by the non-significance of self-esteem and change attitudes for the rest of the sample or it may be that there is no such relationship. Further research conducted with larger samples which have high involvement in a change task may reveal this.

Finding 3: Role was the only demographic variable to be a predictor of change attitude. It combined with the lowest level need component to predict personal change attitude and with the highest level need component to predict task change attitude.

The series of regression equations consistently showed role as the variable most related to both change attitudes. This implies that personal involvement in an innovation is a basis for one's attitude toward it. Given this condition, lower level needs and the highest level needs performed as expected, with the former related to personal change attitude, and the latter to task change attitude.

The performance of the need variables in tandem with role was expected in light of the theory and research of Hackman and Lawler (1971), Wanous (1974), Brief and Aldag (1975), and by Slocum (1971). These researchers found that workers at lower levels of need fulfillment were more strongly motivated by matters extrinsic to their jobs. Apparently, this can be extended from routine job behaviors to personal concerns experienced in work changes. In addition, the relationship reported by Hackman and Lawler of higher order need desire and positive response to intrinsic job motivators also appears applicable to teachers' attitudes in change situations. As Hackman and Lawler point out, individuals are most likely to engage in job behaviors to the extent that they believe they can obtain valued intrinsic or extrinsic outcomes, indicating a need for involvement in the job situation.

This finding adds a motivational perspective to Hall's (1979) Concerns-Based Adoption Model. CBAM theory and research posited that teachers pass through a predictable series of concerns, with personal concerns emerging quite early. However, CBAM did not account for individual differences in the intensity

of these concerns. This research suggests that teachers at lower levels of need fulfillment will experience stronger personal concerns than those at higher levels, who can be expected to have the most intense task concerns at the outset of innovations, making their attitudes toward the innovation most favorable.

A word of caution is in order about this finding. It was obtained from a relatively small sample, based on only one innovation. Although the relationships described above consistently appeared in several regressions, their magnitude was modest. It is most appropriate to interpret this as an indication of a relationship which deserves further study with larger samples in other contexts.

Finding 4: Self-esteem was not a predictor of change attitude.

Three plausible explanations are offered for this unanticipated outcome. First, it may be that the innovation, the School Effectiveness Program, was not perceived as a threat by the teachers in this sample. It is possible that an adequate level of arousal for a self-esteem threat to occur was not generated. Wylie (1979) and Wells and Marwell (1976) both note the importance of arousal for self-esteem to motivate one's behavior, and Wiener's (1973) research demonstrated the moderating effects of involvement on the satisfaction reactions to tasks of subjects at various levels of self-esteem. With this sample, these conditions may not have occurred.

A second possible explanation for the lack of significance in this relationship deals with the Porter Need Satisfaction

Questionnaire, the instrument which supplied self-esteem data. As its name implies, the PNSQ is primarily concerned with need satisfaction, including self-esteem as it is a part of this overall construct. Self-esteem correlated at .59 with self-actualization. This means that there was little variance in task change attitude not accounted for by self-actualization that could be explained by the self-esteem subset. Since more than half of the items on the PNSQ measured esteem needs, it was inappropriate to add a specific self-esteem instrument to this research. However, it is an open question whether different results could be obtained in research which focused solely on self-esteem, omitting the broader need fulfillment framework.

The third possible explanation concerns the empirical literature on self-esteem, largely derived from laboratory studies where threats were manipulated by the experimenter. The research samples in most cases were high school or college students. The inclusion of this variable in this research was predicated on observations in the literature that the threats employees faced in changes were congruent with situations in which self-esteem was an issue. Thus, self-esteem was tested in an exploratory manner in this study.

The present findings question the generalizability of these earlier results to adults in teaching settings. In laboratory research, the investigator is often able to direct the subject's attention to the variables under question, blocking out competing sources of influence on attitudes or behavior. Employees are often able to structure their work environments

to maintain favorable conditions, creating the possibility that they are able to fall back on many protective devices which cusion the threatening impact of changes (Katz and Kahn, 1978). Thus, unless the changes are truly major, employee self-esteem may be adequately insulated to soften the threats from less sweeping innovations. The speculation is offered that the threats described in the literature were not present in this research or were at a very low degree.

Finally, Korman (1970, 1977) and the host of researchers who expanded his theories (Greenhaus and Bodin, 1974; Bhagat and Chassie, 1978; Lopez and Greenhaus, 1978; and others) found that self-esteem moderated the performance-satisfaction relationship through the expectancy for good performance it creates. This position has been contradicted by Dipboye, et al. (1979), and by Orpen and Lisus (1974). This research agrees with the latter group, with the conjecture that the threat perceived in this innovation was too mild or incompletely understood at this early stage of the change process to arouse the self-esteem of the teachers in this sample, rendering it inactive.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations are offered for further research:

1. Investigate whether self-esteem per se, not as a need fulfillment construct, is related to personal and/or task change concerns.
2. Employ a specific self-esteem instrument to explore a self-esteem-change attitude relationship.
3. Investigate whether this relationship is moderated by level of perceived involvement in the innovation.

4. Investigate the need fulfillment-change attitude relationship with other innovations and with larger samples.

5. Investigate whether the strength of the need fulfillment-change attitude relationship is moderated by various levels of perceived threat from the innovation.

6. Investigate whether employees at different levels of need fulfillment vary in their change attitudes.

7. Investigate whether other aspects of job satisfaction than need fulfillment are related to change attitudes.

References

Anderson, M. B. The study of the differences among perceived need deficiencies, perceived burnout, and selected background variables for classroom teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1981.

Bhagat, R. S., & Chassie, M. B. The role of self-esteem and locus of control in the differential prediction of performance, program satisfaction, and life satisfaction in an educational organization. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1978, 13, 317-326.

Blumberg, A. School organizations: A case of generic resistance to change. In M. M. Milstein (Ed.), Schools, Conflict, and Change. New York: Teachers College Press, 1980.

Brief, A. P., & Aldag, R. J. Employee reactions to job characteristics: A constructive replication. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 182-186.

Dipboye, R. L., Zultowski, W. H., Dewhirst, A. D., & Arvey, R. D. Self-esteem as a moderator of performance-satisfaction relationships. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1979, 15, 193-206.

Dore, R., & Meacham, M. Self-concept and interest related to job satisfaction of managers. Personnel Psychology, 1973, 26, 49-59.

Edmonds, R. Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 1979, 37, 15-24.

George, A. A. Personal communication, October 10, 1981.

Goodlad, J. The dynamics of educational change: Toward responsive schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Badin, J. J. Self-esteem, performance, and satisfaction: Some tests of a theory. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 722-726.

Hackman, J. R., & Lawler, E. E., III. Employee reactions to job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 259-286. (Monograph)

Hall, G. E. Using the individual and the innovation as the frame of reference for research on change. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1979.

Hall, G. E., George, A. A., & Rutherford, W. L. Measuring stages of concern about the innovation: A manual for the use of the SoC questionnaire (2nd ed.). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1979.

House, E. R. The politics of educational innovation. Berkeley, CA.: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1974.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

Kerr Inkson, J. H. Self-esteem as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 243-247.

Korman, A. K. Toward an hypothesis of work behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 31-41.

Korman, A. K. Organizational Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Lopez, E. M., & Greenhaus, J. H. Self-esteem, race, and job satisfaction. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1978, 13, 75-83.

Lortie, D. Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Miles, M. B. Educational innovation: The nature of the problem. In M. B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Miles, M. B. School innovation from the ground up: Some dilemmas. New York University Education Quarterly, 1980, 11, 2-9.

Orpen, C., & Lisus, G. Self-esteem and the relationship between need fulfillment and job satisfaction. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1974, 93, 307-308.

Porter, L. W. A study of perceived need satisfactions in bottom and middle management jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1961, 45, 1-10.

Porter, L. W. Job attitudes in management: Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1962, 46, 375-384.

Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E., III. Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1968.

Sarason, S. B. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Reading, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon Co., 1971.

Slocum, J. W., Jr. Motivation in managerial levels: Relationship of need satisfaction to job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 312-316.

Trusty, F. M., & Sergiovanni, T. J. Perceived need deficiencies of teachers and administrators: A proposal for restructuring teacher roles. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1966, 2, 168-180.

Wanous, J. P. Individual differences and reactions to job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 616-622.

Waters, L. K., & Roach, D. Factor analysis of need fulfillment items designed to measure Maslow need categories. Personnel Psychology, 1973, 26, 185-190.

Weber, R. J., & Hadd, T. A. A factor analytic examination of the internal structure of a Maslow-type need satisfaction instrument. Charlettesville, VA.: University of Virginia, 1974 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 103 441).

Wells, L. E., & Marwell, G. Self-esteem: Its Conceptualization and measurement. Beverley Hills, CA.: Sage Publications, 1976.

Wiener, Y. Task-ego involvement and self-esteem as moderators of situationally devalued self-esteem. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 58, 225-232.

Wylie, R. C. The self-concept. (Rev. ed., Vol. 2) Lincoln: University of Nebrasks Press, 1979.

Yarworth, J. S. The relationship between personal factors, role ambiguity, role conflict and teacher job satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1978.

PROFESSIONAL FACTORS INFORMATION SHEET

1. Please list the last four digits of your Social Security number (for data processing).

   ____ ____ ____ ____

Please supply the following information or check the appropriate space.

2. Teaching Assignment:

   Classroom Teacher _____ Grade _____

   Specialist _____ (Please name your assignment.)
   (Examples: Music, Speech, Librarian, Special Education, etc.)

3. Teaching Setting:

   You are a teamed teacher if you regularly collaborate with other teachers for planning, instruction, or diagnosis of students' needs.

   Self-Contained Teacher _____

   Teamed Teacher _____

4. Level of Education:

   Please check the highest degree level you have completed.

   1) Bachelor's Degree _____

   2) Master's Degree _____
      (or bachelor's + 30)

   3) 6th Year or Ph.D. _____

5. How long have you been aware of the Effective Schools Project?

   _____

6. If you would like a summary of the results of these questionnaires, please check this box. ☐

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

This list contains several characteristics connected with your school position. For each such characteristic, you will be asked to answer the following questions:

a. How much of the characteristic is there now connected with your school position?
b. How much of the characteristic do you think should be connected with your school position?

Sample question:
The opportunity for independent thought and action in my school position.

a) How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
b) How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

For each of the 13 items, answer questions a and b by circling a number from 1 to 7 in the corresponding space following each question. Low numbers represent low amounts or low importance, and high numbers represent high amounts or high importance.

SOURCE: PORTER, JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY, 1962, 375-384.

1. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment in my school position.

a) How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
b) How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

2. The opportunity for personal growth and development in my school position.

a) How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
b) How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

3. The feeling of self-esteem a person gets from being in my school position.

a) How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
b) How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

4. The feeling of self-fulfillment a person gets from being in my school position (that is, the feeling of being able to use one's unique capabilities, realizing one's potentialities).

a) How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
b) How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

5. The prestige of my school position inside the school (that is, the regard received from others in the school).

a) How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
b) How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

6. The opportunity, in my school position, to give help to other people.

a) How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
b) How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. The authority connected with my school position.

   a) How much is there now?
   (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
   b) How much should there be?
   (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

8. The opportunity, in my school position, for participation in the determination of methods and procedures.

   a) How much is there now?
   (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
   b) How much should there be?
   (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

9. The prestige of my school position outside the school (that is, the regard from others not in the school).

   a) How much is there now?
   (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
   b) How much should there be?
   (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

10. The opportunity for independent thought and action in my school position.

    a) How much is there now?
    (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
    b) How much should there be?
    (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

11. The opportunity to develop close friendships in my school position.

    a) How much is there now?
    (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
    b) How much should there be?
    (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

12. The opportunity, in my school position, for participation in the setting of goals.

    a) How much is there now?
    (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
    b) How much should there be?
    (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

13. The feeling of security in my school position.

    a) How much is there now?
    (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
    b) How much should there be?
    (min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

CHANGE ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond to these items in terms of your present concerns, or how you feel about your involvement or potential involvement with the Effective Schools Project. Think about this innovation in terms of your own perceptions of what it involves. Since this questionnaire is used for a variety of purposes, the name Effective Schools Project never appears. However, phrases such as "the innovation", "this approach", and the "new system" all refer to the Effective Schools Project. Remember to refer to each item in terms of your present concerns about your involvement or potential involvement with the Effective Schools Project.

Sample question:

0	1	2 3 4 5	6 7
Irrelevant	not true of me now	somewhat true of me now	very true of me

1. I am concerned about students' attitudes toward this innovation. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Answer each item below by circling the number from 0 to 7 which best indicates the strength of your concerns.

0	1	2 3 4 5	6 7
Irrelevant	not true of me now	somewhat true of me now	very true of me

SOURCE: HALL, GEORGE, RUTHERFORD, A MANUAL FOR USING THE STAGES OF CONCERN QUESTIONNA...

1. I am concerned about students' attitudes toward this innovation. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. I would like to help other faculty in their use of the innovation. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. I have a very limited knowledge about the innovation. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. I would like to know the effect of reorganization on my professional status. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. I would like to develop working relationships with both our faculty and outside faculty using the innovation. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. I am concerned about how the innovation affects students. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I would like to know who will make the decisions in the new system. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. I would like to discuss the possibility of using the innovation. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. I would like to know what resources are available if we decide to adopt this innovation. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. I would like to know how my teaching is supposed to change. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. I would like to familiarize other departments or persons with the progress of this new approach. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. I am concerned about evaluating my impact on students. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. I would like to excite my students about their part in this approach. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. I would like to know what the use of the innovation will require in the immediate future. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. I would like to coordinate my effort with others to maximize the innovation's effect. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. I would like to have more information on time and energy commitments required by this innovation. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. I would like to know what other faculty are doing in this area. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. I would like to use feedback from students to change the program. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. I would like to know how my role will change when I am using the innovation. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. I would like to know how this innovation is better than what we now have. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE